



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 12, 2004

Mr. James L. Hall
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
P. O. Box 4004
Huntsville, Texas 77342-4004

OR2004-5686

Dear Mr. Hall:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 205048.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state that you will provide the requestor with some of the requested information. You claim that portions of the remaining requested information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy.¹ Information is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy when it is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) of no legitimate public interest. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The common-law right to privacy encompasses the specific types of information that the Texas Supreme Court held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See* 540 S.W.2d at 683 (information relating to sexual assault,

¹ Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information that is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy.

pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs). This office has since concluded that other types of information also are also protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing information attorney general has determined to be private), 470 at 4 (1987) (illness from severe emotional job-related stress), 455 at 9 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), 343 at 1-2 (1982) (references in emergency medical records to drug overdose, acute alcohol intoxication, obstetrical/gynecological illness, convulsions/seizures, or emotional/mental distress).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App. — El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court applied the common-law right to privacy addressed in *Industrial Foundation* to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. The investigation files at issue in *Ellen* contained third-party witness statements, an affidavit in which the individual accused of the misconduct responded to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court upheld the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the disclosure of such documents sufficiently served the public's interest in the matter. *See id.* The court further held, however, that "the public does not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.* Based on our review of the submitted information, we find that a portion of this information, which we have marked, reveals the identity of an alleged victim of sexual harassment. Accordingly, we conclude that the department must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy.

You claim that other portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information that is encompassed by the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body maintains the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *See id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal

counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element.

Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *see id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication." *See id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

Based on your representations and our review of these portions of the submitted information, we agree that this information constitutes communications exchanged between privileged parties in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to a client. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. The department may withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining submitted information to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the

governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJB/krl

Ref: ID# 205048

Enc. Marked documents

c: Mr. Rene Casarez
1160 FM 2824
Beeville, Texas 78102
(w/o enclosures)